

REMARKS

Claims 10 and 11 are new. No new matter has been added. Support for the claims can be found in the originally filed Specification and claims.

Claims 5 and 7 to 11 are pending in the present application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the following remarks.

Claims 5 and 7 to 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,072,777 to Bencheck et al. (“Bencheck reference”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,682,383 to Dahod et al. (“Dahod reference”).

As discussed in Applicants’ earlier submissions, the Bencheck reference purportedly concerns determining a root cause of error activity in a network, the root cause analysis operating on problem alert signals (PASs) generated by monitoring points in the network such as a threshold crossing alert PAS. Col. 3, lines 11-18. In Fig. 1, a network management system 100 having five layers is apparently displayed. One of those layers is labeled a network element layer (a physical layer) having various network elements used in the transport and routing of network traffic. The accompanying text recites that each network element 151 – 156 in the physical layer 150 can be designed to provide performance monitoring, alarm and status information to the higher layers in a network management system 100.

The Dahod reference appears to concern an arrangement for interconnecting groups of users into collision domains in a Local Area Network such as an Ethernet involving a plurality of repeater groups, with each repeater group being connected to a group of user stations. The Dahod reference further refers to the arrangement involving an electronically reconfigurable switch matrix, the switch matrix having a plurality of segment lines (or other transmission media), each of which is used to form one collision domain or Ethernet segment.

In contrast to both the Bencheck and Dahod references, claim 5 of the present invention requires all three devices: a network management device, a service management device, and a domain manager. The domain manager has access to a selected network management device, and is linkable to the selected service management device. The network management device is assigned to each network and is controllable by the service management device. Further, claim 5 requires a controllable matrix to link the at least one service management device to the at least one domain manager.

In contrast, the Bencheck reference does not consider such a system. The Bencheck reference involves, as recited in the accompanying text to Fig. 1, a corporate policy layer, a lower business management layer 120, a lower network management layer 130, a lower element manager layer 140, and a lower network element layer 150, and then delves into observing root cause analysis. The Bencheck reference does not teach or suggest that a selected service management device is *linkable* to a domain manager and controls a network management device. The Bencheck reference also does not teach or suggest that the domain

manager *has access to* the selected network management device. Instead, the Bencheck reference teaches away from the present invention and instead appears to promote a system in which it is the network manager which communicates with an element manager, and the element manager which is connected to a network element. Further, the Bencheck reference does not identically describe a controllable matrix to link the at least one service management device to the at least one domain manager.

While the Dahod reference does describe a reconfigurable switch matrix, it does not cure the deficiencies of the Bencheck reference in that the Dahod reference also does not teach or suggest that a selected service management device is *linkable* to a domain manager and controls a network management device, or that the domain manager *has access to* the selected network management device. Accordingly, even if combined, the Bencheck and Dahod references do not teach or suggest every feature of the claims.

Claims 5 and 7 to 9 concern a different system than the Bencheck and Dahod references, alone or in combination. In addition to the above reasons, claim 7 to 9, for example, further require the at least one service management device to be linked by a controllable matrix to the at least one domain manager.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 5 and 7 to 9, are allowable over the Bencheck and Dahod references, and kindly request withdrawal of the rejection of those claims.

Claims 10 and 11 depend from base claim 5 and are believed allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 5.

Also, Applicants respectfully request a telephone interview with the Examiner – if amenable – to discuss the present application.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, it is believed that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of claims 5 and 7 to 9 have been overcome. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that all claims 5 and 7 to 11 are allowable. It is therefore respectfully requested that any outstanding rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn, and that the present application issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 8, 2008

By: /Linda Lecomte/
Linda Shudy Lecomte (Reg. No. 47,084)
KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200 (telephone)
(212) 425-5288 (facsimile)

CUSTOMER NO. 26646